

REMARKS

Examiner Owens is again thanked for his thorough evaluation of the present application. It is again strongly felt that arguments presented regarding independent Claim 19, previously submitted 10/02 in response to office action of 8/02, clearly distinguish applicant's structure from Examiner's cited prior art, the prior art consisting specifically of Iwasaki (US 5,907,772), in view of Fukase (US 5,656,529).

The unique structure described by applicant in independent Claim 19, last amended 12/05/01, features a cylindrical storage node structure highlighted by an underlying polysilicon shape supporting an overlying agglomerated metal silicide layer. The key structural feature is the agglomerated metal silicide layer located on all exposed surfaces of the underlying polysilicon shape, however not present on any other surface. Examiner argues that Iwasaki (US 5,907,772), teaches a cylindrical polysilicon shape while Fukase (US 5,656,529) teaches an agglomerated metal silicide layer, and therefore the combination of these prior art results in applicant's structure being obvious. However applicant's structure shows the agglomerated metal silicide layer on all exposed surfaces of the underlying polysilicon shape, including the agglomerated metal silicide layer on all sides of, and on top surfaces of the vertical features of the polysilicon shape, as well as on the exposed bottom surface of the bottom of the same underlying

polysilicon shape. (In addition agglomerated metal silicide is not present on any other surface of the structure. This very attractive feature allowing the maximum of surface area of agglomerated metal silicide, wherein the agglomerated metal silicide is only located on all exposed features of the underlying cylindrical polysilicon shape, is not an easy feature to form via simple process sequences, thus the presence of such a structure is not seen in prior art. One would have to employ a specific process sequence to obtain applicant's structure, (agglomerated metal silicide on all exposed vertical and horizontal features of a cylindrical polysilicon storage node without the presence of the same agglomerated metal silicide on non-polysilicon surfaces), therefore applicant's structure remains unique. Surely if one's objective is to increase surface area applicant's structure would be the ultimate example. Since applicant's structure remains unique, the combination of the Iwasaki and Fukase prior arts did not lead to applicants structure, and thus applicants structure is not an obvious consequence of these prior art. The fact that neither prior art, with the same objective as applicant, or subsequent prior art with the privilege of seeing the Iwasaki and Fukase prior art, arrived at applicant's desirable and unique structure, shows that applicant's unique structure was, or is not obvious via a combination of the prior arts. Again none of the prior art shows agglomerated metal silicide only on all vertical and horizontal features of a cylindrical polysilicon structure.

Therefore it is felt that applicant's structure, described in amended independent Claim 19, is novel and unique, when compared to Examiner's cited prior art. Applicants use of a combination of features such as: a storage node structure comprised of an cylindrical polysilicon shape featuring uniformly doped vertical shapes completely covered by agglomerated metal silicide layer on all exposed vertical and horizontal features, is clearly distinguishable, and novel, when compared to Examiner's cited prior art. No combination of the prior art can claim applicant's unique structure. The feature of locating agglomerated metal silicide only on exposed surfaces of the cylindrical polysilicon shape and not on any other surface, is not easily obtainable and therefore not previously described in prior art. Therefore it is strongly felt that no combination of prior arts can be used to describe applicants structure. Applicant has claimed his process in detail. The structure described in Figs. 1 - 10, and in Claims 19 - 21, are both believed to be novel and patentable over these various references, because there is not sufficient basis for concluding that the combination of claimed elements would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. We therefore request Examiner Owens to reconsider his rejections of independent Claim 19, and of dependent Claim 20 - 21, referencing amended independent Claim 19, in view of these arguments.

TSMC97-232B

Allowance of all claims is requested.

It is requested that should Examiner Owens not find that the Claims are now Allowable that he call the undersigned attorney at 845-452-5863, to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg # 37,761